

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **1.) Claim Amendments**

Claims 30-32, 34-42, and 44-58 are pending in the application. The Applicant has amended claims 49 and 52-55 to correct problems under 35 U.S.C. § 112. No other substantive amendments have been made. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **2.) Information Disclosure Statement**

The Examiner stated that the IDS filed on 09/07/2006 failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) because it was received as a blank page. The Applicant has enclosed herewith, another copy of the IDS. Consideration of the cited references is respectfully requested.

### **3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

The Examiner objected to claims 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner contends there is no support in the specification for a third mobile node. The Applicant agrees and notes that in the previous response, the original claim language “another mobile node” was misconstrued as a third mobile node while, instead, it refers to the second mobile node. The Applicant has amended claims 52-55 to refer to the second mobile node. Withdrawal of the rejection under § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

### **4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claim 49 (and dependent claims 50-55) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The term “the locating information” lacked antecedent basis in claim 49. The Applicant has amended claim 49 to provide

antecedent basis for "the locating information". Withdrawal of the rejection under § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 52-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The indefiniteness was caused by the Applicant's amendment to recite a third mobile node instead of the second mobile node. This has been corrected in claim 52. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection under § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

#### **5.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner repeated the rejection of claims 30-32, 34-42, 44-47, and 49-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carden (US 2001/0039592 A1) in view of Van Gassel, et al. (US 2006/0031515 A1).

It is difficult for the Applicant to substantively respond directly to the Examiner's arguments because the Examiner has selectively disagreed with some of Applicant's arguments, and ignored others. For example, Applicant argued that Carden does not show combining the telephone number of the mobile with a web service identifier, or registering the combined identifier/telephone number with a registration unit. The Examiner disagreed and cited paragraph 0021 of Carden for showing the identifier/telephone number combination, but he was silent as to the registering step. The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of Carden with respect to the showing of a unique identifier, as discussed further below.

In his discussion of Van Gassel, the Examiner did not respond substantively to the Applicant's arguments regarding limitations that are not shown. Instead, he said one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually when the rejection is based on a combination of references. Clearly, however, the references have to be discussed one at a time in order to show that there are *common features* that are not shown by either one, and thus are not shown or suggested by the combination. Applicant's arguments identified a number of common features that are not disclosed or suggested by either Carden or Van Gassel. If the Examiner had looked at the preceding paragraph addressing Carden, he would have seen that the same

limitations were identified as missing in the references. Thus the combination of Carden and Van Gassel does not disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitations and therefore, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required by MPEP 2143.

By way of further explanation, a distinguishing feature between the claimed invention and the combination of Carden and Van Gassel is that in the invention, a web service registration is identified by a web service identifier and a unique circuit-switched identifier while in Carden, web addresses and email addresses are identified by a telephone number. Therefore the steps:

receiving by a registration unit, a request from the first mobile node to register the web service of the first mobile node, the request including unique identification information comprising the web service identifier and a unique circuit-switched identifier of the first mobile node; and

registering, at the registration unit, the unique identification information together with locating information for the web service at the first mobile node;

are not shown or suggested in Carden.

Van Gassel also fails to disclose or suggest these steps. Van Gassel discloses an ad hoc process enabling a user device without an Internet connection to send information to another user device having an Internet connection so that the user device without the connection can access the Internet through the user device having the connection. (Para. 0012-0019). Thus, Van Gassel fails to disclose a first mobile node sending a web service identifier and unique circuit-switched identifier (such as the first node's telephone number) to the registration unit, registering the information at the registration unit, obtaining the information from the registration unit by a second mobile node, and using the information obtained from the registration unit to communicate with the web service at the first mobile node.

A technical effect achieved by the invention's distinguishing feature is that the unique identifier in the invention enables coordination of all web service requests. The objective problem is hence to achieve an improved web service registration procedure. This is very different from both Carden and Van Gassel.

There may often be situations with more than one web service at the respective mobile nodes. With the conventional registration solutions, there would then be a need for some kind of coordinating means inside the mobile device that coordinates all web services requests. By using the claimed invention, the coordination can be achieved through use of the web service identifier part of the unique identification information. Hence, the mobile phone will be perceived as an "ordinary" web server and all services can be accessed through different addresses.

The complexity of the above-described situation may be further increased due to the fact that many end-users may wish to purchase/download the same web service. Therefore, the registration procedure needs to be such that not only the first user will succeed in registering a particular web service. It is therefore desirable that if an end-user registers a service, it should have a unique name so that every mobile device that has purchased/downloaded the web service is able to register it. This is achieved by the unique identification information. Again, the use of unique identification information is not taught or suggested by Carden or Van Gassel.

Even if Carden shows a telephone number combined with web addresses, Carden does not show any unique identification information associated with web service registration.

In addition, Carden does not relate to coordination of service requests and does not contain any guidance for a person of ordinary skill to solve the above-stated object.

Further, Carden and Van Gassel do not show an identifier comprising circuit switched identifier in combination with a web service identifier.

Further, since Carden and Van Gassel do not mention web service registration nor indicate a need for web service registration procedures, and in particular do not teach or suggest the use of corresponding unique identification information, it would not be obvious for a person of ordinary skill to arrive at the solution of the present invention.

Therefore, the withdrawal of the obviousness rejections and the allowance of claims 30-32, 34-42, 44-47, and 49-58 are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carden (US 2001/0039592 A1) in view of Van Gassel, et al. (US 2006/0031515

A1) and further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (See Background of current specification). The Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 48 is also allowable for the reasons discussed above.

**6.) Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 30-32, 34-42, and 44-58.

The Applicant requests a telephone interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven W. Smith, Reg. No. 36,684/

Date: January 24, 2011

Steven W. Smith  
Registration No. 36,684

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572  
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com